



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,008	08/09/2001	Heejune Ahn	K-0310	3596
34610	7590	12/07/2004	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			CUMMING, WILLIAM D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2683	
DATE MAILED: 12/07/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/925,008

Applicant(s)

HEEJUNE AHN

Examiner

WILLIAM D CUMMING

Art Unit

2683

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): USC §103(a) rejection of claim 8.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: 8.Claim(s) rejected: 1-7 and 9-29.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
WILLIAM CUMMING  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2683

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: During examination before the Patent and Trademark Office, claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation and limitations from the specification may not be imputed to the claims (Ex parte Akamatsu, 22 USPQ2d, 1918; In re Zletz, 13 USPQ2d 1320, In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11). A prior art reference must be considered together with the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art, In re Samour, 197 USPQ 1. During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." Claim term is not limited to single embodiment disclosed in specification, since number of embodiments disclosed does not determine meaning of the claim term, and applicant cannot overcome "heavy presumption" that term takes on its ordinary meaning simply by pointing to preferred embodiment (Teleflex Inc. v. Ficosa North America Corp., CA FC, 6/21/02, 63 USPQ2d 1374). Applicant had the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be *interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA1969). *The specification is* not the measure of the invention. Therefore, limitations contained therein can not be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art (In re Sporck, 155 USPQ 687). Attempt to invoke limitations present in the preferred embodiment but absent from the claims themselves violates the established claim construction principles.

This application is still not in condition for allowance.